DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 329 931 CS 010 483

AUTHOR Herrmann, Beth Ann; Pendarvis, Phyllis W.
TITLE A Collaborative Study of Collegial Coaching within a Restructuring School Environment: Perspectives from a Middle School Administrator and a Reading Educator. Draft.
PUB DATE Nov 90
NOTE 22p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Reading Conference (40th, Miami, FL, November 27-December 1, 1990).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Educational Innovation; Educational Research; *Inservice Teacher Education; *Instructional Effectiveness; Intermediate Grades; Junior High Schools; Middle Schools; Models; School Restructuring; *Teacher Administrator Relationship
IDENTIFIERS *Collegial Coaching; Instructional Hierarchies; Instructional Management

ABSTRACT

A preliminary study described the effects of collegial coaching (classroom-based collaborative, self-reflective professional dialogue among teachers and administrators for the purpose of improving practice) on middle school teachers' classroom restructuring efforts and their conceptual understanding of effective literacy instruction and instructional leadership. Subjects, a female reading educator, a female middle school principal, and three of the principal's literature teachers enrolled in a year-long, school-based literacy course taught by the reading educator, completed teacher concept questionnaires and reflective journals as part of the course. Data were also gathered through open-ended discussions and field notes of classroom observations and coaching sessions. Preliminary results indicated: (1) some teachers' conceptual understandings about instructional leadership were slow to change, which may explain why it is so difficult for some teachers to assume new roles in restructuring schools; and (2) while there is tremendous potential for collegial coaching as a way of helping teachers assume new roles in restructuring schools, its true potential may never be realized unless apparent problems associated with providing it are resolved. (One table describing the four phases of the study is included; 15 references are attached.) (RS)

**********
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
**********

DRAFT - Do not cite without permission from the authors

ED329931

# A Collaborative Study of Collegial Coaching Within a Restructuring School Environment: Perspectives from a Middle School Administrator and a Reading Educator

Beth Ann Herrmann
College of Education
University of South Carolina
Wardlaw 203
Columbia, South Carolina 29208
(803) 777-4836

Phyllis W. Pendarvis
Irmo Middle School Campus R
6051 Wescott Road
Columbia, South Carolina 29210
(803) 732-8200

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

CS010483

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Beth Ann Herrmann
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Paper presented at the annual meeting of the National Reading Conference, Miami, FL

November 1990

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

A Collaborative Study of Collegial Coaching Within a Restructuring School Environment: Perspectives from a Middle School Administrator and a Reading Educator

"Teacher-as-coach" -- "teacher empowerment" -- "teacher-researcher" are familiar catchwords these days for describing new roles for teachers in restructured schools (Sizer, 1990; Holmes Group, 1990). For most teachers, however, these are radically different roles and difficult ones to assume.

A general assumption is that coaching plays a crucial role in helping teachers in restructuring schools assume new roles. Little is known, however, about effective coaching within a restructuring school environment - what it looks like, who provides it and how it differs from coaching provided in a non-restructuring school. This study represents a beginning in this direction.

## Background

Coaching has become a popular intervention in the professional development of teachers and in associated processes of implementing curriculum reform and introducing new instructional approaches. Joyce and Showers (1980) were among the first to use the term "coaching" to describe inservice conditions needed to improve teachers' practice and increase their teaching repertoires (Joyce & Showers, 1980). In the past five years a coaching model based on the work of Joyce and Showers has gained widespread popularity across the nation and beyond (Shalaway, 1985). The model is designed to help teachers integrate innovative techniques into their existing teaching practice through an observation-feedback cycle.

While this type of coaching model has contributed much to improving inservice training for teachers, the effectiveness of the model as a strategy of broad professional development is questionable because of the technical (top-down) nature

of the model. As noted by Hargreaves and Dawe (1990), technical coaching falls short because it

> . . . fails to treat teachers and the sources of their "resistance" in some cases, sufficiently seriously . . . it underestimates the real-world, contextual problems that teachers have to encounter as they try to apply their newly learned skills in a busy classroom world that makes multiple and persistent demands on their time and attention . . . the technical coaching model is uncritical and neglectful of the conditions of its own existence, or the political and ideological forces which enhance its administrative appeal. (p. 232).

Additional problems with technical coaching stem from a general misuse of the technique by administrators grounded in earlier coaching models emphasizing supervision, evaluation and judgment (Anderson & Krajewski, 1980; Snyder & Anderson, 1986).

These inherent weaknesses in the technical coaching model are particularly important given the current movement toward school restructuring which emphasizes collegiality, self-reflection and inquiry and collaborative classroom-based research among teachers and administrators. As such, an alternative coaching model -- collegial coaching -- may prove to be more effective in restructuring schools. Collegial coaching is directed more to the context of teaching and to the processes of self-reflection and professional dialogue among teachers needed to improve practice and to alter the organizational context in such a way as to assist that improvement (Hargreaves & Dawe, 1990). In contrast to the football-like technical model described earlier where coaching emphasizes teachers carrying out set plays developed ahead of time by the coach, the collegial coaching model more closely resembles hockey in that participants work on interpreting emerging patterns and events "on the fly" and on responding fluidly and adaptively to these events as they develop (Duffy, 1990).

This type of coaching model has important implications for school restructuring whereby teachers are attempting to make major instructional changes and assume

new roles, but before it can become a useful "restructuring tool" collegial coaching must be thoroughly explored, from the inside-out, within a restructuring school environment. Exploratory in nature, this study focuses on the collaborative efforts of a middle school principal and a reading educator to provide collegial coaching within a restructuring school environment.

## Purpose

The primary purpose of the study is to describe the effect of collegial coaching on three middle school teachers' (a) conceptual understandings of effective literacy instruction and instructional leadership and (b) classroom restructuring efforts. The study is also designed to describe difficulties associated with providing collegial coaching within a restructured school environment. For the purpose of this paper, (a) collegial coaching is defined as classroom-based collaborative, self-reflective professional dialogue among teachers and administrators for the purpose of improving practice and (b) instructional leadership is defined as classroom-based collegial coaching provided by an administrator.

Two research questions are posed:

1. What is the effect of collegial coaching on three middle school teachers' (a) conceptual understandings of effective literacy instruction? (b) conceptual understandings of instructional leadership? (c) classroom restructuring efforts?
2. What difficulties are associated with providing collegial coaching within a restructuring school environment?

## Method

### Subjects

The subjects of this study are one female reading educator, one female middle school principal, and three of the principal's literature teachers (Teachers S, A and N). The principal and the teachers are enrolled in a year-long, school-based literacy course taught by the reading educator.

The principal had 15 years experience in the school as a classroom teacher, a counselor and an assistant principal prior to becoming the principal. She is currently enrolled in an educational leadership and policy doctoral program in a large southeastern university. The reading educator has six years classroom teaching experience and seven years experience as a reading educator. She is currently employed in the university where the principal is enrolled as a doctoral student, but the reading educator is not directly involved with the principal's doctoral work. The reading educator and the principal share similar interests in school and teacher education restructuring. Both the principal and the reading educator have volunteered to study themselves within the context of this investigation because they both want to learn more about collegial coaching within a restructuring school environment.

Teachers A and N are ninth grade teachers in the middle school where the study is being conducted. Teacher A has taught two years and Teacher N has taught six years. Teacher S, who has taught seven years, is an eighth grade teacher in the same school. The teachers have volunteered to participate in the study because they want to learn how to restructure their classrooms to provide more effective literacy instruction for their low achieving students who are "turned off" to reading and writing.

Context

This study is part of a two-year collaborative university-school restructuring project at the middle school where the study is being conducted. The school and the restructuring project are described in the following sections.

The school. The school is a large southeastern urban middle school with 1,275 students and 87 teachers. In January, 1990 the school received a $90,000 school innovation grant to incorporate the eight major recommendations for restructuring the middle school included in Turning Points: Preparing American Youth for the

21st Century (Carnegie Corporation, 1989). The restructuring effort focuses on (1) creating small communities for learning by assigning students to teacher teams, (2) integrating learning within a core curriculum, (3) organizing teaching and learning to increase opportunity for success for all students, (4) increasing teacher control and decision-making, (5) broadening teachers' repertoire with innovative teaching methods, (6) promoting health and fitness throughout the school program, (7) involving apathetic parents, and (8) integrating community civic and service clubs into the school plan. Restructuring efforts include creating teacher units and student advisory programs, a core curriculum and after-school programs including an after-school Literacy Enrichment Program coordinated by the reading educator.

A new school-wide peer-coaching model also is being implemented in the school. Based on the work of Joyce and Showers (1982), the model was originally designed by members of the State Department of Education as a concluding module for a state-wide effective schools training program (Gottesman, Crain & Fuller, 1988). The model is used in the target school to "off-set" formal teacher evaluation used for supervision and evaluation of specific teaching behaviors and broaden teachers' repertoire with innovative teaching methods. Within this framework teachers observe each other without praise, blame, evaluation, or statements about feelings, impressions or beliefs. The teacher and the observer-coach together analyze the data but the teacher decides what to do with the observed facts. The teacher may request alternatives or suggestions from the observer-coach. The principal is participating in the coaching program as part of a principal incentive program sponsored by the State Department of Education. As such, she is supporting the program by endorsing and introducing the concept to the entire faculty, but she is also participating in the program by providing released time and class coverage for classroom observations, attending training sessions and participating as an observer-coach.

The restructuring project. A collaborative university-school partnership was established in July 1990 by the reading educator and principal which led to a two-year restructuring project, co-directed by the school principal and the reading educator. Initiated in August 1990, the restructuring project focuses on (a) innovative literacy instruction designed to increase opportunity for success for all students, particularly low achieving students, (b) teacher control and decision-making relative to their English and literature classes and curriculum, (c) parent involvement in their children's developing literacy and (d) collegial coaching.

Following an initial meeting with the school administrators, a lead English teacher and the reading educator, two subsequent meetings at the district level were held with elementary Reading and Language Arts teachers and middle school English and literature teachers to recruit teacher participants. Fifteen teachers from three different schools volunteered to participate in the project along with the target school principal and assistant principal.

Year 1 (1990-1991) of the project consists of a year-long, school-based literacy seminar course taught by the reading educator. Initially, all fifteen volunteers teachers and the two administrators enrolled in the course, but after the first two class meetings, six teachers dropped out of the course because of other commitments and the administrators decided to audit the course because of time constraints. Three eighth grade teachers, one seventh grade teacher and two ninth grade teachers from the target school and two sixth grade teachers from the neighboring elementary schools remained in the course. Primarily, the course consists of (a) weekly seminar meetings to explore new concepts relative to school restructuring (e.g., collegial coaching and teacher empowerment), effective literacy instruction (e.g., whole language and cognition) and social, emotional and cognitive aspects of school restructuring (e.g., difficulties with assuming new roles), (b) bi-monthly classroom-based observations, and individual conferences

with each teacher conducted by the reading educator and the principal and (c) bi-monthly classroom-based demonstrations by the reading educator.

The course is theoretically driven by current understandings of essential schools (Sizer, 1990), teacher-researcher partnerships (Cochran-Smith & Lytle, 1990), whole language (Watson, 1989), teacher empowerment (Holmes Group, 1990) and collegial coaching (Hargreaves & Dawe, 1990). The course is unique for several reasons. First, underlying course themes include (a) teacher thinking and decision-making, (b) student-as-worker rather than teacher as-deliverer-of-instructional-services and (c) risk taking. Second, emphasis is placed on a limited number of areas of knowledge and teacher education practices are tailored to meet the needs of every teacher. Third, the course is designed to facilitate systematic inquiry and reflection on the part of the teachers and the administrators through collaborative experiences that allow them to assume responsibility for their own learning. For example, a major part of the course focuses on classroom and school-based research conducted by teacher teams and the reading educator and the administrators who function as a team. The teachers' projects focus on developing and implementing effective literacy instruction grounded in current theories of cognition and whole language and the effect of this type of instruction on their low achieving students' abilities to comprehend text and their attitudes toward reading and writing. The teacher educator/administrator team is exploring collegial coaching as described in this paper. Each research team is free to explore issues they identify as significant relative to their topic. As such, each team collaboratively identified their own research questions as well as data collection and analysis techniques. Fourth, the teachers engage in on-going collaborative reflective inquiry within the context of authentic teaching experiences in their own classrooms. For example, the teachers collaboratively explore traditional (skills-based) and current theories of cognition and whole language, implications these theories have for instruction and

instructional materials, but more importantly, ways to merge these three theories currently dominating the literacy field. Important literacy issues relative to merging these theories (e.g., state and local mandates) as well as important teacher-school change issues (e.g., school restructuring and teacher empowerment) are also collaboratively explored by the teacher teams. Fifth, emphasis is placed on teacher metacognitive control of instruction and teacher adaptiveness. Finally, classroom-based collegial coaching, designed to help the teachers transform new concepts into practice, is a major component of the course. Coaching is used in two ways by both the teacher educator and the principal. First, on an on-going basis the principal and the teacher educator team-coach the teachers during bi-monthly class seminar sessions. The purpose of these group coaching sessions is to help the teachers develop closer, but also intellectually more open, working relationships with each other. In this context the principal and the teacher educator lead the teachers in self-reflective professional dialogue about new concepts and innovative practices relative to effective literacy instruction, and important issues relative to teacher change and school restructuring. Second, on an individual basis, the principal and the teacher educator each coach the teachers before and after observed lessons. The purpose of these coaching sessions is to help the teachers transform abstract concepts discussed during the bi-monthly class sessions into concrete instructional actions within the teachers' classrooms. Before each lesson the coach and the teacher collaboratively discuss the teacher's intentions. After each lesson the teacher and the coach collaboratively discuss the events of the lesson within the framework of various concepts discussed in the bi-monthly sessions and how they can be adapted to the classroom situation generally and to the events of the observed lesson specifically.

During Year 2 of the study (1991-1992) six additional teachers will be recruited to join the restructuring project. Year 2 teachers will be teamed with Year 1

teachers who will coach and mentor the new teachers.

Data Collection and Analysis

Data are collected during four phases of the study described in Table 1. The purpose of Phase I of the study was to foster collaborative planning of the course and the teacher research projects. The purpose of Phase II was to build strong, trusting relationships among the teachers, the principal and the teacher educator relative to classroom visits and risk-taking - an essential component of collegial coaching. Phases III and IV are designed to foster collaborative sharing and discussion of data among the administrators, the teachers and the reading educator to provide the basis for creating mutual understandings, exploring new understandings about effective literacy instruction and coaching and explore important questions and issues relative to instructional leadership and the teacher's restructuring efforts.

---

Insert Table 1 about here

---

Data are collected through the use of teacher concept questionnaires, reflective journals, open-ended discussions and field notes of classroom observations and coaching sessions. Data sources and data collection procedures are described in the following sections.

Teacher concept questionnaires. A teacher concept questionnaire is used on a pre, mid and post basis to measure and describe changes in the teachers' conceptual understandings of effective literacy instruction (Part I) and instructional leadership (Part II). Items included in the concept questionnaire are shown in Table 2. At the end of the study the questionnaires will be rated by two graduate students trained to use criteria and scoring procedures outlined by Herrmann and Duffy (1989). The teachers' responses will also be used to provide descriptive evidence of conceptual

change.

---

Insert Table 2 about here

---

Reflective journals. On a weekly basis the teachers, the principal and the teacher educator write in reflective journals. The teachers write about changes in their conceptual understandings of effective literacy instruction and instructional leadership as well as changes in their instructional actions or classroom restructuring efforts. The reading educator and principal write about changes in their conceptual understandings of coaching and coaching actions, difficulties associated with providing collegial coaching, apparent changes in the teachers' conceptual understandings about effective literacy instruction and instructional leadership and apparent changes in the teachers' instructional actions.

Open-ended discussions. Open-ended discussions are conducted on an individual basis by the reading educator and the principal and the reading educator and the teachers during all four phases of the study. Discussions focus on concepts explored in class seminar meetings, issues and problems associated with school and classroom restructuring, low achieving students, literacy instruction, coaching and the relationships between coaching and evaluation.

Observations and field notes. The principal and reading educator make extensive field notes during coaching sessions conducted with the teachers and observed lessons, specifically noting interactions, information provided, responses to information provided, perceptions of the responses, activities and/or tasks provided, and any other information relative to the research questions posed for the study.

## Preliminary Results and Discussion

Phase III of this year-long study is currently in progress. To date, (a) nine

class seminar sessions have been conducted, (b) three open-ended discussions about effective literacy instruction and coaching have taken place between each teacher and the reading educator, (c) five open-ended discussions about effective literacy instruction and coaching have taken place between the principal and the reading educator including a half-day retreat for the same purpose, (c) the principal has observed and coached with Teacher N twice, (d) the teacher educator has observed and coached with all three teachers once, and (e) the reading educator has conducted one demonstration lesson in each teacher's classroom.

Data collected relative to the teachers' conceptual understandings and instructional actions are just beginning to be shared and discussed by the principal, the teachers and the reading educator. As such, it is too soon to report firm findings. This paper focuses on preliminary findings from Phase I and II of the study which suggest little change in two of the teachers' conceptual understandings of instructional leadership (Teachers S and N), but a slight shift in the other teacher's conceptual understandings of instructional leadership from a technical to a more collegial cognitive orientation. This paper also focuses on difficulties associated with providing collegial coaching within a restructuring school environment.

Teachers' Conceptual Understandings

Preliminary findings from the teachers' pre and mid-year concept questionnaires suggest little change in the conceptual understandings of Teachers N and S relative to instructional leadership. For example, in both questionnaires, the teachers tended to describe instructional leadership in technical terms as illustrated in the following questionnaire responses.

Teacher N: (pre) Instructional leadership is the ability to inspire, motivate and direct other instructors. The overall goal [of instructional leadership] is to make teachers more effective and confident in teaching students. Administrators should become involved with teacher's students. They should be present in the classroom as well as the office.

Teacher N: (mid-year) Instructional leadership [should] lead teachers to conform to curriculum expectations and provide expertise in classroom problem-solving. The overall goal instructional leadership is to coordinate individuals to provide consistent opportunities for students. Administrators should visit classrooms, spend a lot of time with students and be accessible to teachers.

Teacher S: (pre) Instructional leadership is leadership in which the administrators and more expert teachers guide and share their expertise with those teachers less experienced . . . The overall goal instructional leadership is to provide opportunities for the growth and development of all concerned, thus, producing positive end results.

Teacher S: (mid-year) Instructional leadership is leadership which capacity of leaders to guide others in better methods of instruction. It also involves supporting those being instructed. The overall goal of instructional leadership is to promote overall better instruction within an educational institution. Administrators should conduct observations, conferences, demonstrations, workshops and sharing sessions.

Overall, both teachers' repeated use of technical terms and phrases to describe instructional leadership (e.g., direct, conform, provide expertise, more expert teacher) and vague, non-committal terms and phrases to describe what administrators should do to provide effective instructional leadership (e.g., visit and be present in the classroom) indicate that the teachers tend to view coaching as a technical process designed to help them learn new techniques or otherwise improve, rather than a collegial process designed to foster trusting relationships and a collaborative classroom culture. There is little indication in both teachers' responses that they view the principal on equal terms when it comes to coaching. Rather, they tend to view the principal as a classroom "visitor" rather than a classroom partner or colleague. Both teachers' responses suggest that they tend to see themselves as subordinate to an "expert" who knows more or who can teach more effectively or is a more effective problem-solver.

In contrast to the questionnaire responses of Teachers N and S, Teacher A's pre and mid-year questionnaire responses suggest that she may be moving from a technical to a collegial cognitive orientation relative to instructional leadership as illustrated in the following pre and mid-year questionnaire responses.

Teacher A: (pre) Instructional leadership resembles a relationship a good coach has with a team. The overall purpose of instructional leadership is to point out strengths and weaknesses and develop understanding between faculty and administration. [Administrators should] separate [instructional leadership] from evaluation, ask for what we need (i.e., what are we struggling with), time, time, time.

Teacher A: (mid-year) Instructional leadership is a lot like brainstorming or effective problem-solving where two people can share, discuss and hopefully find solutions for everyday teaching dilemmas. The overall goal of instructional leadership is to help teachers do their job better and create a unity between the teaching staff and administrators. Administrators should keep in touch with their teachers, have an open door policy and time for teachers and allow teachers free time to work during inservice days.

Teacher A's use of the terms brainstorming, problem-solving and unity in her mid-year response indicates that she may be beginning to see coaching as more of a collegial rather than the technical process she described earlier (i.e., point out strengths and weaknesses).

In sum, overall, there appears to be little change in the teachers' conceptual understandings of instructional leadership. All three teachers still tend to hold the principal at "arm's length" when it comes to coaching. A possible explanation for this apparent lack of substantive change in the teachers' conceptual understandings may have something to do with the school's teacher evaluation program whereby all three teachers are formally and informally evaluated by the principal. The teachers may be experiencing some cognitive confusion between the coaching and evaluation roles of the principal.

Difficulties Associated with Providing Collegial Coaching

A number of difficulties associated with providing collegial coaching have been mutually identified by the reading educator and the principal. First, at the heart of collegial coaching are strong, trusting relationships. Both the reading educator and the principal are having difficulty building this type of relationship with all three teachers. The teachers seem to have preconceived notions about relationships they are "supposed to have" with reading educators and administrators. In addition,

there is an apparent tendency on the part of all three teachers to think that the reading educator and the principal have "hidden agendas" when it comes to coaching despite concerted efforts by both the reading educator's and the principal to assure the teachers that their coaching efforts are genuinely designed to empower them and create collaborative classroom cultures. Teacher comments during open-ended discussions indicate that all three teachers tend to believe that there are inadequacies in their teaching - that there is something they are supposed to learn - that they do not see themselves as equal partners in the coaching process. Second, classroom-based collegial coaching requires an extraordinary amount of time. For the administrator, it is particularly difficult for her to balance administrative duties and collegial coaching, even though four assistant principals help her with the administrative duries. Somedays, coaching has to be squeezed in between meetings, phone calls, conferences, lunch duty and other typical administrative duties. Third, both the reading educator and the principal are having difficulty helping the teachers transform abstract concepts into concrete instructional actions within the context of their own classrooms. Fourth, both the reading educator and the principal have a tendency to slip into a technical coaching role because it tends to save time and the teachers sometimes prefer more direct feedback on their lessons. Finally, there is a tension between teacher evaluation and collegial coaching in the target school. The tension stems from two sources. First, the principal is responsible for evaluating the target teachers. Comments made during open-ended discussions with the principal indicate that she is having some difficulty playing both roles which she agrees are contradictory. Comments made during open-ended discussions with the teachers indicate that in the end, what counts the most for them is how many points they get on the evaluation instrument. Second, the theoretical basis for the teacher evaluation instrument is completely contradictory to the theoretical basis for collegial coaching. For example, during teacher evaluation

sessions, the teachers are judged on how well they comply with specific district-mandated standards and behaviors. During the collegial coaching sessions, the teachers are expected to engage in self-reflection and professional dialogue within a non-compliant framework.

In sum, a number of difficulties associated with collegial coaching are creating difficulties for both the reading educator and the principal. These difficulties are negatively affecting both reading educator's and the principal's efforts to promote and support teacher empowerment, self-reflection and professional dialogue among the teachers.

## Preliminary Conclusions

Firm conclusions cannot be made on the basis of preliminary data, but at this point in the study, two preliminary conclusions are offered here as points-to-ponder. First, some teachers' conceptual understandings about instructional leadership are slow to change which may, in part, explain why it is difficult for some teachers to assume new roles in restructuring schools. Second, while there is tremendous potential for collegial coaching as a way of helping teachers assume new roles in restructuring schools, its true potential may never be realized unless apparent problems associated with providing it - such as the ones explored in this paper - are resolved. We propose to openly shared and discussed these apparent problems with the teachers as the study progresses. The results of these discussions will appear in a later paper.

References

Anderson, R. & Hrajewski, R. (1980). Goldhammer's clinical supervision a decade later. Educational Leadership, 2, 420-423.

Bissex, G. & Bullock, R. (1987). Seeing for ourselves: Case study research by teachers of writing. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Carnegie Council on Adolescent Development. (1989). Turning points: Preparing American youth for the 21st century. Carnegie Corporation, New York: Author.

Cochran-Smith, M. & Lytle, S. L. (1990). Research on teaching and teacher research: The issues that divide. Educational Researcher, 19 (2), 2-11.

Duffy, G. (1990). What counts in teacher education? Dilemmas in educating empowered teachers. Presidential address at the National Reading Conference, Miami, FL.

Gottesman, B., Crian, P. & Fuller, S. (1988, Fall). Peer coaching: How teachers use it. Palmetto Administrator.

Hargreaves, A. & Dawe, R. (1990). Paths of professional development: Contrived collegiality, collaborative culture, and the case of peer coaching. Teaching and Teacher Education, 6 (3), 227-241.

Herrmann, B. A. & Duffy, G. G. (1989, April). Relationships between teachers' conceptual understandings, teacher responsiveness and student outcomes: Two exploratory studies in teacher education settings. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, CA.

Holmes Group. (1990). Tomorrow's schools. East Lansing, MI: Author.

Joyce, B. & Showers, B. (1980). Improving inservice training: The message of research. Educational Leadership, 40 (1), 4-10.

Joyce, B. & Showers, B. (1982). The coaching of teaching. Educational Leadership, 40 (5), 5-10.

Roehler, L. R., Duffy, G. G., Conley, M., Herrmann, B. A., Johnson, J., & Michelsen, S. (1987, April). Exploring preservice teachers' knowledge structures. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Washington, D.C.

Shalaway, L. (1985). Peer coaching . . . Does it work? R and D Notes, Washington National Institute of Education, September 6-7.

Sizer, T. (1990). From schoolhouse to statehouse: Restructuring our schools through re-learning. A teleconference produced by Simon & Schuster School Group, Morristown, NJ.

Snyder, K. & Anderson, R. (1986). Managing productive schools: Toward an ecology. Orlando, FL: Academic Press.

Table 1

The Four Phases of the Study

**Phase I: Planning** ( August - Mid-September, 1990)

A. Bi-monthly sessions with the administrators by the reading educator to discuss

1. a collaborative instructional leadership research project
2. important concepts relative to instructional leadership roles (e.g., teacher evaluation vs. instructional leadership)
3. the nature of pre and post lesson coaching sessions and classroom-based observations
4. the role of the reading educator in the teacher-administrator coaching sessions
5. a workable schedule for coaching and observation sessions
6. potential problems with providing classroom-based instructional leadership

B. Weekly sessions with the teachers by the reading educator to discuss

1. personal and professional interests in restructuring their classrooms
2. concerns about low achieving students and curriculum mandates
3. their ideas for restructuring their classrooms and their classroom-based research projects
4. their role in the instructional leadership research project

**Phase II: Creating a Comfort Zone** (Mid-September - October, 1990)

A. Bi-monthly meetings with the administrators by the reading educator to discuss

1. professional literature relative to the instructional leadership research project
2. class seminar sessions they missed due to their auditing status
3. issues and concerns relative to the instructional leadership research project

B. A half-day retreat with the administrators and the reading educator to discuss

1. issues and problems relative to the two-year university-school collaborative restructuring project
2. mutual concerns about the instructional leadership research project
3. issues and problems relative to their roles as instructional leaders
4. conceptual changes in their conceptual understandings of instructional leadership

C. Bi-monthly informal meetings with the teachers by the administrators to

1. get them used to the idea of classroom observations and coaching sessions
2. assure the teachers that the coaching and observations sessions have nothing to do with teacher evaluation
3. provide moral support for their restructuring efforts

D. Weekly informal meetings with the teachers by the reading educator to discuss

1. concepts and ideas discussed and shared in the weekly seminar meetings
2. professional literature relative to their classroom-based research projects
3. problems and concerns about their low achieving students
4. classroom observations by the administrators and the reading educator

E. Weekly class seminar meetings with all the teachers in the project by the reading educator to discuss

1. new concepts and issues relative to school and classroom restructuring
2. professional literature relative to effective literacy lessons

**Phase III: Testing the Waters** (November - December, 1990)

A. Bi-monthly coaching sessions and classroom observations with the teachers by the administrators to

1. develop an understanding of the nature of lessons they plan to teach
2. discuss observed lessons

B. Bi-monthly classroom visits with the teachers by the reading educator to discuss

1. demonstration lessons conducted with their students
2. the progress of their classroom-based research projects and issues and problems relative to their research projects
3. discuss their perceptions of the administrators' roles as instructional leaders and the nature of their instructional leadership

C. Bi-monthly meetings with the administrators by the reading educator to discuss

1. the reading educator's perceptions of the administrators' role as instructional leaders and the nature of their instructional leadership
2. the teachers' perceptions of the administrators' roles as coaches and the nature of their instructional leadership

3. factors that appear to be impeding classroom-based instructional leadership (collegial coaching)

4. the progress of the instructional leadership research project and issues and problems relative to the instructional leadership research project

5. the relationship between the administrators' conceptual understandings of instructional leadership and what they do to provide instructional leadership

6. the effect of collegial coaching on the teachers' restructuring efforts and abilities to assume new roles

**Phase IV: Mudding the Waters** (January - April, 1991)

A. Bi-monthly teamed coaching sessions and classroom visits with the teachers by the administrators and the reading educator to discuss

1. innovative reading and writing lessons

2. demonstrated innovative reading and writing lessons

3. conceptual changes about effective literacy instruction and instructional leadership

B. Bi-monthly meetings with the administrators by the reading educator to discuss

1. collegial coaching techniques

2. changes in the administrators' conceptual understandings of coaching and teacher evaluation

C. Bi-weekly class seminar meetings with all project teachers by the reading educator to discuss

1. new concepts and issues relative to school and classroom restructuring

2. professional literature relative to innovative reading and writing programs

3. classroom-based research in progress